

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
 RICHARD J. POCKER (NV Bar No. 3568)
 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 800
 Las Vegas, NV 89101
 Telephone: 702.382.7300
 Facsimile: 702.382.2755
 rpocker@bsflp.com

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
 GARRISON LLP
 WILLIAM A. ISAACSON (*pro hac vice*)
 KAREN DUNN (*pro hac vice*)
 2001 K Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20006
 Telephone: 202.223.7300
 Facsimile: 202.223.7420
 wisaacson@paulweiss.com
 kdunn@paulweiss.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and
 Oracle International Corp.

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
 BENJAMIN P. SMITH (*pro hac vice*)
 JOHN A. POLITO (*pro hac vice*)
 SHARON R. SMITH (*pro hac vice*)
 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Telephone: 415.442.1000
 Facsimile: 415.442.1001
 benjamin.smith@morganlewis.com
 john.polito@morganlewis.com
 sharon.smith@morganlewis.com

DORIAN DALEY (*pro hac vice*)
 DEBORAH K. MILLER (*pro hac vice*)
 JAMES C. MAROULIS (*pro hac vice*)
 ORACLE CORPORATION
 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7
 Redwood City, CA 94070
 Telephone: 650.506.4846
 Facsimile: 650.506.7114
 dorian.daley@oracle.com
 deborah.miller@oracle.com
 jim.maroulis@oracle.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;
 ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware
 corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL
 CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation;
 AND SETH RAVIN, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-VCF

**ORACLE'S MOTION TO SEAL
 ORACLE'S OBJECTION TO
 MAGISTRATE JUDGE
 FERENBACH'S REPORT AND
 RECOMMENDATION ON
 ORACLE'S MOTION FOR
 SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO
 RULE 37**

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order governing confidentiality of documents entered by the Court on May 21, 2010, ECF No. 55 (“Protective Order”), Local Rule 10-5(b), Rules 5.2 and 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International Corporation (collectively “Oracle” or “Plaintiffs”) respectfully request that the Court grant leave to file under seal certain portions of Oracle’s Objection to Magistrate Judge Ferenbach’s Report and Recommendation on Oracle’s Motion For Sanctions Pursuant to Rule 37 (the “Motion”). A redacted version of this document was filed on October 5, 2019. ECF No. 1434. A version of this document without redactions will be subsequently filed under seal with the Court and linked to the filing of this motion.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) provides broad discretion for a trial court to permit sealing of court documents for, inter alia, the protection of “a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). For sealing requests relating to non-dispositive motions, such as Oracle’s Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to Rule 37, the presumption of public access to court filings may be overcome by a showing of good cause under Rule 26(c). *See Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010); *Kamakana v. Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006). *See also* ECF No. 317 (granting Oracle’s 2012 Motion to Seal Plaintiffs’ Motion for Evidentiary Sanctions for Spoliation for “good cause” shown). The Court has “broad latitude” under Rule 26(c) “to prevent disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, but not limited to” the commercial information described in Rule 26(c)’s text. *Phillips v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002) (citations omitted).

The Protective Order states, “Counsel for any Designating Party may designate any Discovery Material as ‘Confidential Information’ or ‘Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only’ under the terms of this Protective Order only if such counsel in good faith believes that such Discovery Material contains such information and is subject to protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). The designation by any Designating Party of any

1 Discovery Material as ‘Confidential Information’ or ‘Highly Confidential Information –
2 Attorneys’ Eyes Only’ shall constitute a representation that an attorney for the Designating Party
3 reasonably believes there is a valid basis for such designation.” Protective Order ¶ 2.

4 Oracle requests that the Court seal portions of its Objection to Magistrate Judge
5 Ferenbach’s Report and Recommendation on Oracle’s Rule 37 Motion for Sanctions (ECF No.
6 1434), as this document contains information that Oracle has designated as “Confidential
7 Information” or “‘Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only” under the Protective
8 Order. Notably, portions of Oracle’s brief contain non-public, technologically and commercially
9 sensitive information relating to Oracle’s software, the public disclosure of which would create a
10 significant risk of competitive injury and particularized harm, and would prejudice Oracle.
11 Oracle’s competitors and potential competitors could use such information to compete unfairly
12 with Oracle.

13 Additionally, portions of Oracle’s brief also contain content that Rimini has designated as
14 Confidential or Highly-Confidential Information under the Protective Order.

15 Oracle further notes that the information in this Motion that Oracle asks this Court to seal
16 comes from Oracle’s original Rule 37 Motion for Sanctions, Rimini’s Opposition brief, and
17 Oracle’s Reply brief, all of which this Court previously permitted the parties to file under seal.
18 *See* ECF No. 1425 (granting Oracle’s Motion to Seal its Rule 37 Motion for Sanctions (*i.e.*, ECF
19 No. 1362), Rimini’s Motion to Seal its Opposition Brief (*i.e.*, ECF No. 1373), and Oracle’s
20 Motion to Seal its Reply Brief (*i.e.*, ECF No. 1378)). This Court has previously granted motions
21 to file under seal portions of other documents that contained the same or similar kinds of
22 confidential information. *See also* ECF Nos. 226, 325, 518, 904, 990, 1107, 1228, 1261, 1349;
23 *see also Rimini II*, Case No. 2:14-cv-1699, ECF No. 627.

24 Oracle has submitted all other portions of its Motion to the Court’s public files, which
25 allows public access to all materials except for the items discussed above. Oracle only requests
26 sealing of documents containing particularly sensitive information. Accordingly, this request to
27 seal is narrowly tailored and would not frustrate the public’s visibility into the judicial process.

1 For the foregoing reasons, Oracle respectfully requests that the Court grant leave to file under seal
2 the portions of the documents discussed above.

3 Morgan, Lewis, and Bockius LLP

4 DATED: October 5, 2020

5 By: /s/ John A. Polito
6 John A. Polito

7
8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle
9 America, Inc. and Oracle International
10 Corporation

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Pending before this Court is Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International Corporation's (collectively "Oracle") Motion to Seal Oracle's Objection to Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's Report and Recommendation on Oracle's Rule 37 Motion for Sanctions. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) provides broad discretion for a trial court to permit sealing of court documents for, *inter alia*, the protection of "a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). Having considered Oracle's Motion to Seal and for good cause existing:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Oracle's Motion to Seal is GRANTED. The Clerk of the Court shall file under seal the following documents and materials:

- Portions of Oracle's Objection to Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's Report and Recommendation on Oracle's Rule 37 Motion for Sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

By: _____

Hon. Larry R. Hicks
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 5th day of October, 2020, I electronically transmitted the foregoing ORACLE'S MOTION TO SEAL ORACLE'S OBJECTION TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FERENBACH'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON ORACLE'S RULE 37 MOTION FOR SANCTIONS and [PROPOSED] ORDER to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to all counsel in this matter; all counsel being registered to receive Electronic Filing.

Morgan, Lewis, and Bockius LLP

DATED: October 5, 2020

By: /s/ John A. Polito

John A. Polito

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle
America, Inc. and Oracle International
Corporation